arXiv:1605.05446v1 [quant-ph] 18 May 2016

Joint remote preparation of an arbitrary four-qubit $|\chi\rangle$-type entangled state *

FU Hao [1)] () CHEN Gui-Bin() LI Xiao-Wei ()
MA Peng-Cheng () ZHAN You-Bang ()
School of Physics and Electronic Electrical Engineering, Huaiyin Normal University, Huaian 223300, China

Abstract: We present two schemes for joint remote preparation of an arbitrary four-qubit $|\chi\rangle$ -type entangled state via three three- and (N+1)-qubit GHZ states as the quantum channel, respectively. In these schemes, two senders (or N senders) share the original state which they wish to help the receiver to remotely prepare. To complete the JRSP schemes, several novel sets of mutually orthogonal basis vectors are introduced. It is shown that, only if two senders (or N senders) collaborate with each other, and perform projective measurements under suitable measuring basis on their own qubits respectively, the receiver can reconstruct the original state by means of some appropriate unitary operations and suitable C-NOT gates. Compared with the previous schemes for the JRSP of four-qubit $|\chi\rangle$-tpye state, the advantages of the present schemes are that the total successful probability of JRSP can reach 1 and the entanglement resource can be reduced.

Key words: Joint remote state preparation, Arbitrary four-qubit $|\chi\rangle$-type entangled state, four-qubit projective measurement

PACS: 03.65. Ud, 03.67. Hk, 03.67. -a

1 Introduction

Multipartite entangled states play a fundamental role in the field of quantum information theory and its applications. So far multipartite entanglement has been well studied theoretically and experimentally (*e.g.* [1]-[9]). A few years ago, Verstraete *et al.* [10] have shown that the four- qubit entangled state may be divided to nine families of states under stochastic local operation and classical communication (SLOCC). Briegel *et al.* [11] introduced a special kind of multipartite entangled states, the so-called cluster states. Lee *et al.* [12] have constructed a kind of four-qubit genuine entangled state $|\chi\rangle$ under SLOCC. This state can be expressed as

$$|\chi\rangle = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}(|0000\rangle-|0011\rangle-|0101\rangle+|0110\rangle +|1001\rangle+|1010\rangle+|1100\rangle+|1111\rangle)_{1234}. \quad (1)$$

The genuine state $|\chi\rangle$ has many interesting entanglement properties. It has been shown that a new Bell inequality is optimally violated by the genuine state $|\chi\rangle$ but not by the four-qubit GHZ state and the cluster state [13]. The state $|\chi\rangle$ has important applications in the quantum information field [14-19].

In the last decade, Lo [20], Pati [21], and Bennett *et al.* [22] presented a new quantum communication scheme that uses classical communication and a previously shared entangled resource to remotely prepare a quantum state. This communication scheme is called remote state preparation (RSP). In RSP, Alice is assumed to know fully the transmitted state to be prepared by Bob, so RSP is called the teleportation [23] of a known state. Compared with the teleportation, RSP requires less classical communication cost than teleportation. Since then, RSP has attracted much attention, various theoretical schemes for generalization of RSP have been proposed and experimental implementations of RSP have been presented [24-45]. Recently, a novel aspect of RSP, called as the joint RSP (JRSP), has been proposed [46-60]. In these schemes of the JRSP [46-60], two senders (or N senders) know partly of original state they wish to remotely preparation, respectively. If and only if all the senders agree to collaborate, the receiver can reconstruct the original quantum state. More recently, Luo and Deng [61] present a scheme for JRSP of an arbitrary four-qubit $|\chi\rangle$-tpye entangled state. One can note easily that, however, their JRSP scheme can not be realized with unit success probability.

In this paper, we proposed two schemes for JRSP of an arbitrary four-qubit $|\chi\rangle$-type state with two and N

Received 31 June 2015
∗ Supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 11547023, No.11174101, No.11074088)
1) E-mail: haofu639@163.com
©2013 Chinese Physical Society and the Institute of High Energy Physics of the Chinese Academy of Sciences and the Institute of Modern Physics of the Chinese Academy of Sciences and IOP Publishing Ltd

senders, respectively. To complete the JRSP schemes, several novel sets of four-qubit measuring basis are introduced. In these schemes, two (or N) senders share the original state, but each sender only partly knows the state. It is shown that, if and only if two (or N) senders agree to collaborate, the receiver can reconstruct the original quantum state. Moreover, it is shown that, for both present schemes, the total successful probability of JRSP can reach 1.

2 JRSP of an arbitrary four-qubit $|\chi\rangle$ entangled state with complex coefficients

We present the joint remote preparation of an arbitrary four-qubit $|\chi\rangle$ entangled state with complex coefficients. In the first scheme the original state is shared by two senders, while the prepared state is shared by N senders in the second scheme.

2.1 JRSP with two senders

Suppose that two senders Alice and Bob wish to help the receiver Charlie remotely prepare the state

$$\begin{aligned}|\psi\rangle \quad &= x_0|0000\rangle + x_1 e^{i\delta_1}|0011\rangle + x_2 e^{i\delta_2}|0101\rangle \\ &+ x_3 e^{i\delta_3}|0110\rangle + x_4 e^{i\delta_4}|1001\rangle + x_5 e^{i\delta_5}|1010\rangle \\ &+ x_6 e^{i\delta_6}|1100\rangle + x_7 e^{i\delta_7}|1111\rangle, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where x_j and $\delta_j (j = 0,1,\cdots,7)$ are real, $\delta_0 = 0$ and $\sum_{j=0}^{7} x_j^2 = 1$. Assume that Alice and Bob share the state $|\psi\rangle$ and they know the state partly, that is Alice knows $x_j (j = 0,1,\cdots,7)$, and Bob knows $\delta_j (j = 0,1,\cdots,7)$, but Charlie does not know them at all. We also suppose that the states shared by Alice, Bob, and Charlie as quantum channel are four GHZ states

$$\begin{aligned}|\lambda_1\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|000\rangle + |111\rangle)_{A_1B_1C_1}, \\ |\lambda_2\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|000\rangle + |111\rangle)_{A_2B_2C_2}, \\ |\lambda_3\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|000\rangle + |111\rangle)_{A_3B_3C_3}, \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where the qubits $A_i (i = 1,2,3)$ belong to Alice, qubits $B_i (i = 1,2,3)$ to Bob, and qubits $C_i (i = 1,2,3)$ to Charlie, respectively.

In order to complete the JRSP, Alice and Bob should construct their measuring bases. The first measuring basis chosen by Alice are two sets of mutually orthogonal bases vectors (MOBVs) $\{|\eta_k\rangle\} (k = 0,1,\cdots,7)$, which are given by

$$\begin{aligned}&(|\eta_0\rangle, |\eta_1\rangle, |\eta_2\rangle, |\eta_3\rangle, |\eta_4\rangle, |\eta_5\rangle, |\eta_6\rangle, |\eta_7\rangle)^T \\ =\ & F(|\xi_0\rangle, |\xi_1\rangle, |\xi_2\rangle, |\xi_3\rangle, |\xi_4\rangle, |\xi_5\rangle, |\xi_6\rangle, |\xi_7\rangle)^T, \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where

$$F = \begin{pmatrix} x_0 & x_1 & x_2 & x_3 & x_4 & x_5 & x_6 & x_7 \\ x_1 & -x_0 & x_3 & -x_2 & x_5 & -x_4 & x_7 & -x_6 \\ x_2 & -x_3 & -x_0 & x_1 & -x_6 & x_7 & x_4 & -x_5 \\ x_3 & x_2 & -x_1 & -x_0 & x_7 & x_6 & -x_5 & -x_4 \\ x_4 & -x_5 & x_6 & -x_7 & -x_0 & x_1 & -x_2 & x_3 \\ x_5 & x_4 & -x_7 & -x_6 & -x_1 & -x_0 & x_3 & x_2 \\ x_6 & -x_7 & -x_4 & x_5 & x_2 & -x_3 & -x_0 & x_1 \\ x_7 & x_6 & x_5 & x_4 & -x_3 & -x_2 & -x_1 & -x_0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{5}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&|\xi_0\rangle = |000\rangle, \quad |\xi_1\rangle = |001\rangle, \quad |\xi_2\rangle = |010\rangle, \quad |\xi_3\rangle = |011\rangle, \\ &|\xi_4\rangle = |100\rangle, \quad |\xi_5\rangle = |101\rangle, \quad |\xi_6\rangle = |110\rangle, \quad |\xi_7\rangle = |111\rangle, \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

The second measuring bases chosen by Bob are two sets of MOBVs $\left\{\left|\tau_j^{(k)}\right\rangle\right\} \quad (k,j = 0,1,\cdots,7)$, which are given by

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(\left|\tau_0^{(k)}\right\rangle, \left|\tau_1^{(k)}\right\rangle, \left|\tau_2^{(k)}\right\rangle, \left|\tau_3^{(k)}\right\rangle, \left|\tau_4^{(k)}\right\rangle, \left|\tau_5^{(k)}\right\rangle, \left|\tau_6^{(k)}\right\rangle, \left|\tau_7^{(k)}\right\rangle\right)^T \\ =\ & G(|\xi_0\rangle, |\xi_1\rangle, |\xi_2\rangle, |\xi_3\rangle, |\xi_4\rangle, |\xi_5\rangle, |\xi_6\rangle, |\xi_7\rangle)^T, \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where $k = 0,1,\cdots,7$ and $G^{(k)}$ is a 8×8 matrix,

$$\begin{aligned} G^{(0)} &= G(1, r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4, r_5, r_6, r_7), \\ G^{(1)} &= G(r_1, 1, r_3, r_2, r_5, r_4, r_7, r_6), \\ G^{(2)} &= G(r_2, r_3, 1, r_1, r_6, r_7, r_4, r_5), \\ G^{(3)} &= G(r_3, r_2, r_1, 1, r_7, r_6, r_5, r_4), \\ G^{(4)} &= G(r_4, r_5, r_6, r_7, 1, r_1, r_2, r_3), \\ G^{(5)} &= G(r_5, r_4, r_7, r_6, r_1, 1, r_3, r_2), \\ G^{(6)} &= G(r_6, r_7, r_4, r_5, r_2, r_3, 1, r_1), \\ G^{(7)} &= G(r_7, r_6, r_5, r_4, r_3, r_2, r_1, 1), \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where $r_j = e^{-i\delta_j} (j = 1,2,\cdots,7)$, and $G(a_1,a_2,a_3,a_4,a_5,a_6,a_7,a_8)$ in Eq. (8) is given by

$$G(a_1,a_2,a_3,a_4,a_5,a_6,a_7,a_8)=$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_2 & a_3 & a_4 & a_5 & a_6 & a_7 & a_8 \\ a_1 & -a_2 & a_3 & -a_4 & a_5 & -a_6 & a_7 & -a_8 \\ a_1 & -a_2 & -a_3 & a_4 & -a_5 & a_6 & a_7 & -a_8 \\ a_1 & a_2 & -a_3 & -a_4 & a_5 & a_6 & -a_7 & -a_8 \\ a_1 & -a_2 & a_3 & -a_4 & -a_5 & a_6 & -a_7 & a_8 \\ a_1 & a_2 & -a_3 & -a_4 & -a_5 & -a_6 & a_7 & a_8 \\ a_1 & -a_2 & -a_3 & a_4 & a_5 & -a_6 & -a_7 & a_8 \\ a_1 & a_2 & a_3 & a_4 & -a_5 & -a_6 & -a_7 & -a_8 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (9)$$

Now let Alice first perform three-qubit projective measurement on the qubits A_1, A_2 and A_3 by using the basis $\{|\eta_k\rangle\}(k=0,1,\cdots,7)$ and publicly announces her measurement outcome. Next, in accordwith Alice's result of measurement, Bob should choose one of the measuring bases $\left\{\left|\tau_j^{(k)}\right\rangle\right\}(k,j=0,1,\cdots,7)$ to measure his qubits B_1, B_2 and B_3. After the measurement, Bob informs Charlie of his result of measurement by the classical channel. According to Alice's and Bob's results, Charlie can reconstruct the original state $|\psi\rangle$ by C-NOT gates and suitable unitary operation. For example, without loss of generality, assume Alice's measurement outcome is $|\eta_1\rangle_{A_1A_2A_3}$, Bob should choose measuring basis $\left\{\left|\tau_j^1\right\rangle\right\}(j=0,1,\cdots,7)$ to measure his qubits B_1, B_2 and B_3, and then inform Charlie of his measurement result by classical channel. Assume result of Bob's measurement is $\left|\tau_3^{(1)}\right\rangle_{B_1B_2B_3}$, the qubits C_1, C_2 and C_3 will be collapsed into the state

$$\begin{aligned}|u\rangle=\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}(&x_1e^{i\delta_1}|000\rangle+x_0|001\rangle-x_3e^{i\delta_3}|010\rangle\\&-x_2e^{i\delta_2}|011\rangle-x_5e^{i\delta_5}|100\rangle-x_4e^{i\delta_4}|101\rangle\\&+x_7e^{i\delta_7}|110\rangle+x_6e^{i\delta_6}|111\rangle)_{C_1C_2C_3}. \quad (10)\end{aligned}$$

According to Alice's and Bob's public announcements, Charlie can perform the local unitary operation $(\sigma_z)_{C_1}\otimes(\sigma_z)_{C_2}\otimes(\sigma_x)_{C_3}$ on his qubits C_1,C_2 and C_3, the state $|u\rangle$ can evolve as

$$\begin{aligned}|u'\rangle=\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}(&x_0|000\rangle+x_1e^{i\delta_1}|001\rangle+x_2e^{i\delta_2}|010\rangle\\&+x_3e^{i\delta_3}|011\rangle+x_4e^{i\delta_4}|100\rangle+x_5e^{i\delta_5}|101\rangle\\&+x_6e^{i\delta_6}|110\rangle+x_7e^{i\delta_7}|111\rangle)_{C_1C_2C_3}. \quad (11)\end{aligned}$$

Next, Charlie introduces an auxiliary qubit C_4 with initial state of $|0\rangle$, and the state (11) will be described as

$$\begin{aligned}|u''\rangle=\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}(&x_0|000\rangle+x_1e^{i\delta_1}|001\rangle+x_2e^{i\delta_2}|010\rangle\\&+x_3e^{i\delta_3}|011\rangle+x_4e^{i\delta_4}|100\rangle+x_5e^{i\delta_5}|101\rangle\\&+x_6e^{i\delta_6}|110\rangle+x_7e^{i\delta_7}|111\rangle)_{C_1C_2C_3}\otimes|0\rangle_{C_4}. \quad (12)\end{aligned}$$

Then Charlie employs in turn three C-NOT gates $C_{C_3-C_4}$, $C_{C_2-C_4}$ and $C_{C_1-C_4}$ on the qubits C_1,C_2,C_3 and C_4, where C_{i-j} denotes that i as control qubit and j as target one. After that, the state $|u''\rangle$ (see Eq.(12)) can be transformed into the desired state $|\psi\rangle$ and the JRSP succeeds in this situation. If Alice's measurement outcomes are the other 7 cases in the basis $\{|\eta_k\rangle\}(k=0,1,\cdots,7)$, Bob should choose appropriate measuring bases $\{|\tau_j^{(k)}\rangle\}(k,j=0,1,\cdots,7)$ to measure his qubits B_1,B_2 and B_3. The corresponding relation of Alice's measurement result $|\eta_k\rangle_{A_1A_2A_3}$ and the measuring basis $\{|\tau_j^{(k)}\rangle\}$ performed by Bob can be described as $|\eta_k\rangle_{A_1A_2A_3}\rightarrow\{|\tau_j^{(k)}\rangle\}(k,j=0,1,\cdots,7)$. Similar to above approach, after Alice's and Bob's measurements, Charlie can reconstruct the original state $|\psi\rangle$ by appropriate unitary operation at his side. It is easily found that, for all the 64 measurement results of Alice and Bob, the receiver Charlie can reconstruct the original state $|\psi\rangle$ by appropriate unitary operations, the success probability of the JRSP process being 1. The required classical communication cost is 6 bits in the scheme.

2.2 JRSP with N senders

The scheme in section 2.1 can be generalized to the case of N senders. Suppose that Alice and Bob_1, Bob_2, . . . , Bob_{N-1} wish to help the receiver Charlie remotely prepare an arbitrary four-qubit $|\chi\rangle$ entangled state

$$\begin{aligned}|\phi\rangle=&x_0|0000\rangle+x_1e^{i\varphi_1}|0011\rangle+x_2e^{i\varphi_2}|0101\rangle\\&+x_3e^{i\varphi_3}|0110\rangle+x_4e^{i\varphi_4}|1001\rangle+x_5e^{i\varphi_5}|1010\rangle\\&+x_6e^{i\varphi_6}|1100\rangle+x_7e^{i\varphi_7}|1111\rangle, \quad (13)\end{aligned}$$

where x_j and $\varphi_j(j=0,1,\cdots,7)$ are real, $\varphi_0=0$ and $\sum_{j=0}^{7}x_j^2=1$. Assume that the N senders know the state $|\phi\rangle$ partly, i.e. Alice knows $x_j(j=0,1,\cdots,7)$, Bob_1 knows $\varphi_j^{(1)}$, Bob_2 knows $\varphi_j^{(2)}$, $\cdots$, Bob_{N-1} knows $\varphi_j^{(N-1)}$, where $\varphi_j=\varphi_j^{(1)}+\varphi_j^{(2)}+\cdots+\varphi_j^{(N-1)}(j=0,1,\cdots,7)$, but Charlie does not know them at all. We also suppose that the N sender and receiver Charlie share three $(N+1)$-qubit GHZ states as the quantum channel, which are given by

$$\begin{aligned}|\varepsilon_1\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(|0\rangle^{\otimes(N+1)}+|1\rangle^{\otimes(N+1)}\right)_{A^{(1)}B_1^{(1)}B_2^{(1)}\cdots B_{N-1}^{(1)}C^{(1)}},\\ |\varepsilon_2\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(|0\rangle^{\otimes(N+1)}+|1\rangle^{\otimes(N+1)}\right)_{A^{(2)}B_1^{(2)}B_2^{(2)}\cdots B_{N-1}^{(2)}C^{(2)}},\\ |\varepsilon_3\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(|0\rangle^{\otimes(N+1)}+|1\rangle^{\otimes(N+1)}\right)_{A^{(3)}B_1^{(3)}B_2^{(3)}\cdots B_{N-1}^{(3)}C^{(3)}},\end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where qubits $A^{(1)}$, $A^{(2)}$ and $A^{(3)}$ belong to Alice, qubits $B_1^{(1)}$, $B_1^{(2)}$ and $B_1^{(3)}$ belong to Bob_1, $\cdots$, qubits $B_{N-1}^{(1)}$, $B_{N-1}^{(2)}$ and $B_{N-1}^{(3)}$ belong to Bob_{N-1}, and $C^{(1)}$, $C^{(2)}$ and $C^{(3)}$ belong to Charlie, respectively. As in the above scheme, the N senders must construct their own measurement basis. The first measuring basis chosen by Alice is still in Eqs. (4) and (5), and the measuring bases chosen by Bob_1, Bob_2, $\cdots$, Bob_{N-1} are $8(N-1)$ sets of MOBVs $\left\{\left|\tau_{jl}^{(k)}\right\rangle\right\}(k=0,1,\cdots,7;j=0,1,\cdots,7;l=1,2,\cdots,N-1)$, which are given by

$$\left(\left|\tau_{0l}^{(k)}\right\rangle,\left|\tau_{1l}^{(k)}\right\rangle,\left|\tau_{2l}^{(k)}\right\rangle,\left|\tau_{3l}^{(k)}\right\rangle,\left|\tau_{4l}^{(k)}\right\rangle,\left|\tau_{5l}^{(k)}\right\rangle,\left|\tau_{6l}^{(k)}\right\rangle,\left|\tau_{7l}^{(k)}\right\rangle\right)^T$$

$$=H_l^{(k)}\left(|\xi_0\rangle,|\xi_1\rangle,|\xi_2\rangle,|\xi_3\rangle,|\xi_4\rangle,|\xi_5\rangle,|\xi_6\rangle,|\xi_7\rangle\right)^T, \quad (15)$$

where $|\xi_m\rangle(m=0,1,\cdots,7)$ are given by Eq. (6), $l=1,2,\cdots,N-1$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
H_l^{(0)} &= H(1,r_{1l},r_{2l},r_{3l},r_{4l},r_{5l},r_{6l},r_{7l}),\\
H_l^{(1)} &= H(r_{1l},1,r_{3l},r_{2l},r_{5l},r_{4l},r_{7l},r_{6l}),\\
H_l^{(2)} &= H(r_{2l},r_{3l},1,r_{1l},r_{6l},r_{7l},r_{4l},r_{5l}),\\
H_l^{(3)} &= H(r_{3l},r_{2l},r_{1l},1,r_{7l},r_{6l},r_{5l},r_{4l}),\\
H_l^{(4)} &= H(r_{4l},r_{5l},r_{6l},r_{7l},1,r_{1l},r_{2l},r_{3l}),\\
H_l^{(5)} &= H(r_{5l},r_{4l},r_{7l},r_{6l},r_{1l},1,r_{3l},r_{2l}),\\
H_l^{(6)} &= H(r_{6l},r_{7l},r_{4l},r_{5l},r_{2l},r_{3l},1,r_{1l}),\\
H_l^{(7)} &= H(r_{7l},r_{6l},r_{5l},r_{4l},r_{3l},r_{2l},r_{1l},1), \quad (16)
\end{aligned}$$

where $r_{jl}=e^{-i\varphi_j^{(l)}}$ $(j=0,1,\cdots,7,l=1,2,\cdots,N-1)$, and $H(a_1,a_2,a_3,a_4,a_5,a_6,a_7,a_8)$ is also a 8×8 matrix which similar to Eq.(9).

Alice first performs the three-qubit projective measurement on her qubits $A^{(1)},A^{(2)}$ and $A^{(3)}$ under the basis $\{|\eta_k\rangle\}$[see Eqs.(4) and (5)] and publicly announces her result of measurement. According to Alice's outcome, Bob_1 , Bob_2 ,$\cdots$, Bob_{N-1} should choose suitable measuring basis in the MOBVs $\{|\tau_{jl}^{(k)}\rangle\}(k,j=0,1,\cdots,7,l=1,2,\cdots,N-1)$ to measure their own qubits $(B_1^{(1)},B_1^{(2)},B_1^{(3)})$, $(B_2^{(1)},B_2^{(2)},B_2^{(3)})$, $\cdots$, $(B_{N-1}^{(1)},B_{N-1}^{(2)},B_{N-1}^{(3)})$, and then inform Charlie of their measurement results, respectively. In accord with the announcement of N senders, the receiver Charlie can reconstruct the original state $|\phi\rangle$ by using appropriate unitary operation and C-NOT gates. For example, without loss of generality, suppose that Alice's measurement result is $|\eta_0\rangle_{A_1A_2A_3}$, then Bob_1 , Bob_2 ,$\cdots$, Bob_{N-1} should choose suitable measuring bases $\{|\tau_{j1}^{(0)}\rangle\}$, $\{|\tau_{j2}^{(0)}\rangle\}$, $\cdots$, $\{|\tau_{j(N-1)}^{(0)}\rangle\}$ [see Eqs.(15) and (16)] to measure their own qubits, respectively. Assume that the Bob_1's measurement result is only $|\tau_{11}^{(0)}\rangle_{B_1^{(1)}B_1^{(2)}B_1^{(3)}}$ while all other senders' results are $|\tau_{0m}^{(0)}\rangle_{B_m^{(1)}B_m^{(2)}B_m^{(3)}}(m=2,3,\cdots,N-1)$, respectively, the qubits $C^{(1)},C^{(2)}$ and $C^{(3)}$ will be collapsed into the state

$$\begin{aligned}
|v\rangle=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}&(x_0|000\rangle-x_1e^{i\varphi_1}|001\rangle+x_2e^{i\varphi_2}|010\rangle\\
&-x_3e^{i\varphi_3}|011\rangle+x_4e^{i\varphi_4}|100\rangle-x_5e^{i\varphi_5}|101\rangle\\
&+x_6e^{i\varphi_6}|110\rangle-x_7e^{i\varphi_7}|111\rangle)_{C^{(1)}C^{(2)}C^{(3)}}. \quad (17)
\end{aligned}$$

According to the results of N senders, Charlie can perform the unitary operation $(I)_{C^{(1)}}\otimes(I)_{C^{(2)}}\otimes(\sigma_z)_{C^{(3)}}$ on the qubits $C^{(1)},C^{(2)}$ and $C^{(3)}$, the state $|v\rangle$ [see Eq.(17)] will evolve as

$$\begin{aligned}
|v'\rangle=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}&(x_0|000\rangle+x_1e^{i\varphi_1}|001\rangle+x_2e^{i\varphi_2}|010\rangle\\
&+x_3e^{i\varphi_3}|011\rangle+x_4e^{i\varphi_4}|100\rangle+x_5e^{i\varphi_5}|101\rangle\\
&+x_6e^{i\varphi_6}|110\rangle+x_7e^{i\varphi_7}|111\rangle)_{C^{(1)}C^{(2)}C^{(3)}}. \quad (18)
\end{aligned}$$

Next, Charlie introduces an auxiliary qubit $C^{(4)}$ with initial state of $|0\rangle$, and makes in turn three C-NOT gates $C_{C^{(3)}-C^{(4)}}$, $C_{C^{(2)}-C^{(4)}}$ and $C_{C^{(1)}-C^{(4)}}$ on the qubits $C^{(1)},C^{(2)},C^{(3)}$ and $C^{(4)}$, the desired state $|\phi\rangle$ can be recovered.

If Alice's measurement results are the other 7 cases in the basis $\{|\eta_k\rangle\}(k=0,1,\cdots,7)$, Bob_1 , Bob_2 ,$\cdots$, Bob_{N-1} should choose suitable measuring bases $\{|\tau_{jl}^{(k)}\rangle\}(k,j=0,1,\cdots,7,l=1,2,\cdots,N-1)$ to measure their own qubits respectively, then Charlie can recover the original state $|\phi\rangle$ by appropriate unitary operations and suitable C-NOT gates. Here we no longer depict them one by one. The corresponding relation of Alice's measurement outcome $|\eta_k\rangle_{A^{(1)}A^{(2)}A^{(3)}}$ and the measuring basis $\{|\tau_{jl}^{(k)}\rangle\}$ performed by Bob_1 , Bob_2 ,$\cdots$, Bob_{N-1} can be described as

$$|\eta_k\rangle_{A^{(1)}A^{(2)}A^{(3)}}\longrightarrow\{|\tau_{jl}^{(k)}\rangle\}, \quad (19)$$

where $k,j=0,1,\cdots,7,l=1,2,\cdots,N-1$. In this scheme, the total successful probability of the JRSP is still 1, and the required classical communication cost is $3N$ bits.

3 Conclusion

In conclusion, we have presented two new schemes for joint remote preparation of an arbitrary four-qubit $|\chi\rangle$-type entangled states. In these schemes, the coefficients of the original states to be co-prepared are all complex. In the first scheme, two sender share an arbitrary four-qubit $|\chi\rangle$-type state, but each sender only partly knows the state, and three three-qubit GHZ states are exploited as the quantum channel. In order to help the receiver remotely prepare the original state, in accord with the knowledge of the original state which she/he known, each sender must construct her/his own three-qubit measuring basis. Firstly, a sender performs a three-qubit projective measurement on her qubits, then, another sender

should choose, according to the measurement result of the first sender, an appropriate three-qubit measuring basis to measure his qubits. After these projective measurements, the receiver can reconstruct the original state by means of appropriate unitary operations and suitable C-NOT gates. Next, we generalize the scheme to N senders' case. In the generalized scheme, the original state is shared by the N senders and the quantum channel shared by the N senders and the receiver are three (N+1)-qubit GHZ states. It is shown that, only if when N senders collaborate with each other, the receiver can remotely reconstruct the original state. To complete the JRSP schemes, some novel sets of three-qubit mutually orthogonal basis vectors have been introduced. After the projective measurements by two senders (or N senders) under these bases respectively, the original state can be recovered by the receiver. Compared with the previous scheme [61], the advantage of our schemes is that the total successful probability of JRSP can reach 1. Furthermore, in the present schemes, the quantum channel only requires three three- or (N+1)-qubit GHZ states, respectively, that is, the entanglement resource can be reduced. Thus, we hope that our schemes will be helpful in the deeper understanding of the process of RSP, and may be useful for the further studies on quantum information science, such as quantum secret sharing and quantum network communication.

References

1 Karlsson A, Bourennane M. Phys. Rev. A, 1998, **58**: 4394
2 Murao M, Jonathan D, Plenio M B, Vedral V. Phys. Rev. A, 1999, **59**: 156
3 Sackett C A, Kielpinski D, King B E, Langer C, Meyer V, Myatt C J, Rowe M, Turchett, Q A, Itano W M, Wineland C M D J. Nature, 2000, **404**: 256
4 PAN J W, Daniell M, Gasparoni S, Weihs G, Zeilinger A. Phys. Rev. Lett., 2001, **86**: 4435
5 ZHAO Z, YANG T, CHEN Y A, ZHANG A N, Zukowski M, PAN J W. Phys. Rev. Lett., 2003, **91**: 180401
6 LI Y, Kobayashi T. Phys. Rev. A, 2004, **70**: 014301
7 Mikami H, LI Y, Kobayashi T. Phys. Rev. A, 2004, **70**: 052308
8 DENG, Z J, FENG M, GAO K L. Phys. Rev. A, 2007, **75**: 024302
9 PENG Z H, ZOU J, LIU X J. J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys.,2008, **41**: 065505
10 Verstraete F, Dehaene J, DeMoor B, Verschelde H. Phys. Rev. A, 2002, **65**: 052112
11 Briegel H J, Raussendorf R. Phys. Rev. Lett.,2001, **86**: 910
12 Lee J, Min H, Oh S D. Phys. Rev. A, 2002, **66**: 052318
13 WU C, Yeo Y, Kwck L C, Oh C H. Phys. Rev. A, 2007, **75**: 032332
14 Yeo Y, Chua W K. Phys. Rev. Lett., 2006, **96**: 060502
15 WANG X W, YANG G J. Phys. Rev. A, 2008, **78**: 024301
16 LIN S, WEN Q Y, GAO F, ZHU F C. Phys. Rev. A, 2008, **78**: 064304
17 XIU X M, DONG H K, DONG L, GAO Y J, CHI F. Opt. Commun., 2009, **282**: 2457
18 QIN S J, WEN Q Y, LIN S, GUO F Z, ZHU F C. Opt. Commun., 2009, **282**: 4017
19 ZHAN Y B, ZHANG Q Y, WANG Y W. Commun. Theor. Phys., 2010, **53**: 847
20 Lo, H K. Phys. Rev. A, 2000, **62**: 012313
21 Pati A K. Phys. Rev. A, 2000 , **63**: 014302
22 Bennett C H, Divincenzo D P, Shor P W, Smolin J A, Terhal B M, Wootters W K. Phys. Rev. Lett., 2001, **87**: 077902
23 Bennett C H, Brassard G, Crepeau C, Jozsa R, Peres A, Wootters W K. Phys. Rev. Lett., 1993, **70**: 1895
24 Devetak I, Berger T. Phys. Rev. Lett.,2001, **87**: 177901
25 ZENG B, ZHANG P. Phys. Rev. A,2002, **65**: 022316
26 Berry D W, Sanders B C. Phys. Rev. Lett.,2003, **90**: 027901
27 Abeysinghe A, Hayden P. Phys. Rev. A, 2003, **68**: 062319
28 Leung D W, Shor P W. Phys. Rev. Lett., 2003, **90**: 127905
29 YE M Y, ZHANG Y S, GUO G C. Phys. Rev. A, 2004, **69**: 022310
30 Kurucz Z, Adam P, Kis Z, Janszky J. Phys. Rev. A, 2005, **72**: 052315
31 ZHAN Y B. Commun. Theor. Phys., 2005, **43**: 637
32 MA P C, ZHAN Y B. Chin. Phys. B, 2008, **17** : 445
33 SHI J, ZHAN Y B. Commun. Theor. Phys.,2009, **51**: 239
34 LIU J M, FENG X L, Oh C H. Europhys. Lett.,2009, **87**: 30006
35 ZHAN Y B. Europhys. Lett.,2012, **98**: 40005
36 PENG X H, ZHU X W, FANG X M, FENG M, LIU M L, GAO K L. Phys. Lett. A, 2003, **306**: 271
37 Babichev S A, Brezger B, Lvovsky A I. Phys. Rev. Lett., 2004, **92**: 047903
38 XIANG G Y, LI J, YU B, GUO G C. Phys. Rev. A, 2005, **72**: 012315
39 Peters N A, Barreiro J T, Goggin M E, Wei T C, Kwiat P G. Phys. Rev. Lett.,2005, **94**: 150502
40 Rosenfcld W, Bcmer S, Volz J, Weber M, Wcinfurter H. Phys. Rev. Lett., 2008, **98**: 050504
41 DAI H Y, CHEN P X, Lianf L M, LI C Z. Phys. Lett. A, 2006, **355**: 285
42 MA P C, ZHAN Y B. Opt. Commun., 2010, **283**: 2640
43 MA S Y, CHEN X B, LUO M X, ZHANG R, YANG Y X. Opt. Commun., 2011 , **284**: 4088
44 WANG D, YE L. Inter. J. Theor. Phys., 2011, **50** : 2748
45 ZHAN Y B, Fu H, LI X W, MA P C. Inter. J. Theory. Phys., 2013, **52**: 2615
46 XIA Y, SONG J, SONG H S. J. Phys. B At. Mol. Opt. Phys., 2007, **40**: 3719
47 An N B, Kim J. J. Phys. B At. Mol. Opt. Phys.,2008, **41**: 125501
48 An N B, Kim J. Int. J. Quantum. Inf.,2008, **6**: 1051
49 HOU K, WANG J, LU Y L, SHI S H. Int. J. Theor. Phys.,2009, **48**: 2005
50 An N B. J. Phys. B At. Mol. Opt. Phys.,2009, **42**: 125501
51 CHEN Q Q, XIA Y, SONG J, An N B. Phys. Lett. A,2010, **374**: 4483
52 An N B. Opt. Commun., 2010 ,**283**: 4113
53 LUO M X, CHEN X B, MA S Y, NIU X X, YANG Y X. Opt.

Commun., 2010, **283**(23): 4796
54 ZHAN Y B, HU B L, MA P C. J. Phys. B At. Mol. Opt. Phys., 2011, **44**: 095501
55 CHEN Q Q, XIA Y, An N B. Opt. Commun.,2011, **284**: 2617
56 HOU K, LI Y B, LIU G H, SHENG, S Q. J. Phys. A Math. Theor., 2011, **44**:255304
57 XIA Y, CHEN Q Q, An N B. J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.,2012, **45**: 335306
58 LUO M X, CHEN X B, YANG Y X, NIU X X. Quantum Inf. Process.,2012, **11** 751
59 LUO M X, PENG J Y, MO Z W. Inter. J. Theor. Phys., 2013, **52**: 644
60 PENG J Y, BAI M Q, Mo Z W. Chin. Phys. Lett.,2014, **31**: 010301
61 LUO M X, DENG Y. Inter. J. Theor. Phys.,2012, **51**: 3027-3036